

The Role of Political Discourse in Ideological Representation and Influence a CDA Perspective in Analyzing the Russian Leadership Discourses over the Ukrainian War.

Belgaid Nazim^{1*} ; Amrani Djallel Eddine²

1- Mouhamed Lamine Débaghine University, Sétif2, Algeria;

nazimbel.1995@gmail.com

2- Amrani Djallel Eddine, Kasedi Merbah University, Ouargla, Algeria;

djdine32@yahoo.co.uk

Submission: 14/09/2024

Acceptance: 28/11/2024

Pulication: 02/06/2025

Abstract:

I order to shed light on how discourse works socially with all the complexities it entails, we attempt to analyze the speeches of President, Vladimir Putin and Mr. Sergey Lavrov about the war in Ukraine. Our study draws on Van Dijk's "social cognition". This considers clues crucial for effective interaction in context— knowledge, ideology, power, domination, and politics— these accompany discursive exchanges. They differ from one social group to another under the close watch of socio-cultural institutions. We follow a qualitative design, adopting corpora for data gathering and quota sampling for the selection of the sources. We apply the tools of the socio-cognitive approach. The findings have revealed that social entities have

* Corresponding author.

developed their own perceptions of the world. These underpin socio-cultural as well as political institutions piloting discursive occurrences and demanding the activation of socially shared knowledge within the purview of power relations and ideology the Russian Elites impose.

Key words: social cognition, discourse, knowledge, ideology, Ukrainian war.

1-Introduction:

One of the most marking events that has captured the attention of the world (media—mainstream and new media—audiences, experts, observers, etc) since February, 2022 is the military intervention by Russia in Ukraine. Actually, accusing Kiev of attempting actively to build military as well as economic ties with the West, Russia launched a large-scale operation in its Western neighbor; simultaneously, the accompanying discourses from both conflicting parties have been mutually and accusingly at work ever since. In fact, the former country's officials, (especially President Vladimir Putin as well as the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Lavrov, top ranking Russian officers, etc) have from the start argued in favor of a "special operation" in Ukraine to stop the "Nazis' threat" as well as NATO's expansion eastward and to counter-argue Western leaders who had been denouncing what they would firmly and repeatedly assert as an "invasion of an independent country" and a "violation of international law". As such, an official Russian form of discourse has emerged; this seems to encompass and encapsulate ideologically loaded perceptions towards the world which equally appears to directly or indirectly fuel Russia's diplomatic and military actions. What deserves consideration, most importantly, turns round imposing such conceptions as dominant ideologies not only domestically, but also internationally. All this entails recourse to discourse and its power. In

addition to the process of discursive construction, mediation, dissemination, and pragmatic influence, which is ensured via the linguistic medium, the evocation of shared knowledge alongside memories and traditions underlies the production as well as reception of the above discourse (Van Dijk, 2014a; Wodak, 2015). Hence, the whole process is, by and large, worthy of attention in the course of the critical discourse analysis-based approach of such discourse.

What seems quite elusive, from the start, is how to unravel the intricacies underlying this systematic building of discourse. In effect, on both ends of the string, interlocutors tend to closely comply with particular socio-cultural norms as patterns ruling discursive exchanges—written or spoken. Interestingly, such standards appear to be ideological in nature. Furthermore, subjects of various social entities sound to have developed their own conceptions with regard to different issues as well; this requires them to resort to some forms of shared knowledge and historical references in the course of discursive acts involving their peers or else others (from other groups). Discourse appears at work in disseminating the above-stated knowledge—socio-cultural and historical, besides. Relations of power alongside ideology and domination and cognition, hence, seem to merge in due course, which renders the whole process not only abstract, but especially very challenging.

In the light of the just evoked state of affairs, some necessary questions need to be formulated as the basis of our investigative work:

- How does discourse build under Russian socio-cultural and political institutions constituting one social entity?

- To what extent do discursive interchanges adhere to such constraints and do these contribute to the shaping of perceptions towards certain world issues, notably the war in Ukraine?
- How does discourse—Russian leadership discourse—help accelerating the mediation and dissemination process on a social and inter-social scale?
- Can we say that discourse, cognition, society, power, politics, and domination by and large interrelate effectively at this level?

In our study, we initially assume that discourse, knowledge, and society intertwine significantly. In daily contextual interactions, group subjects usually rely upon their knowledge about the functioning of the world; that is to say the way they construe what frequently occurs in their lives. Importantly, this makes part of their cognitions, which arises as mental representations of themselves and others. Most importantly, the set of socio-cultural and political norms constituting the fabric of any social grouping require participants to fully comply with them to carry out their discursive acts. Henceforth, this would apply closely to the seemingly warfare of statements and counter-statements issued by Russian leaders in justification of their relevant standpoints and their actions. To this end, it appears that such state men have found in political discourse the most effective and reliant tool to disseminate their respective stances over the current armed conflict in Ukraine. Accordingly, the influential role of discourse with its pragmatic outcomes and its shaping of audiences' visions nationally and internationally is remarkably compelling.

The main aim of this study builds around the unraveling of the intricacies relating to the socio-cultural as well as historical dimension underlying and piloting interpersonal interactions through political discourse—notably that produced by Russian leadership. In the course of the CDA (critical discourse analysis) approach to the selected leadership's statements, we will try to ascertain and explain how the discursive processes are activated from the socio-cultural and politico-historical levels (shared knowledge) to the fabrication and reception ones (by producers and recipients). This would, hence, give impetus to the application of CDA tools in the uncovering of the so-called: power relations, political institutions, knowledge, ideology, discourse, and control with regard to current issues in our globe. In this regard, we put Russian leadership's discourses on the conflict in Ukraine (the decision to launch the military operation—President Putin and the reasons underlying it—Mr. Sergei Lavrov) to discursive test to help unveil such discursive complexities.

What this work intends as an outcome is to expose and explain how doing politics intersects with: discourse, social cognition, knowledge, epistemology, power, as well as domination. To achieve this, we aim to adequately narrow the scope of study covering the war in Ukraine. Specifically, we try to track down the way the Russians construe the whole situation basing on their shared and historical knowledge. Hence, we hopefully attempt to bridge the gap between practicing politics and CDA or, more precisely, political discourse analysis (PDA) alongside discursive workings; that is to say, multiple fields crisscross each other in addressing the representation of the afore-mentioned armed conflict. In short, it is not only the battlefield and the military arsenal deployed that can decide the course of events, but equally the

power of discourse can be of paramount importance in maintaining the status quo or sweeping it altogether to the benefit of those holding power.

Concerning the research design followed in this work, we would say it builds upon a thoroughly qualitative frame work. The approach adopted is, actually, expository, descriptive; indeed, Van Dijk's "theory of context" with its socio-cognitive, multi-disciplinary foundations makes up the CDA tool of analysis along the way. In actuality, the CDA-oriented approach deals with what underlies discourse in terms of socio-cultural and political institutions, alongside historical frames of references. Such constraints, since they are constantly adhered to by social members, form what is called "social knowledge". These regulate interpersonal interactions on a daily basis encapsulating power relations as well as ideological standpoints (social cognition). That is to say, the just-mentioned generic knowledge constitutes the context equally enacted by discourse (Van Dijk, 2014c).

With regard to the data collection tool, we opt exclusively for corpora; this can be attributed to the very fact that our analytical enterprise addresses the statements of certain politicians whose presence in the conflict is discernible in the media spheres and elsewhere. In effect, their remarkable declarations as well as statements constitute the core of this work. These appear respectively on a mainstream media channel—TRT World, a Turkish news network— and Associated Press, an American news agency for news production and distribution. Henceforth, we would like to observe that the stated corpora assume a spoken form—in this case we will undertake its transcription for subsequent analysis.

For the sampling procedure, our choice is piggy backed on quota sampling. The latter, which can be a feature of qualitative research, consists

in choosing certain categories of relevant features or characteristics; afterwards, particular cases are placed within these as categories sharing such constitutive features being representative of respectively larger communities—populations— (Flick as cited in Newman, 2014; Newman, 2014). In other words, politicians who have typically socio-cultural and political standpoints (discourses) in common seem to belong to various and even possibly opposing communities on the national or international level. As a matter of fact, we will, in our case, attempt to specifically sample the discourses produced by the most notably influential leadership of Russia; i.e., our sampling is non-random in this case. This is, as just stated, due to the paramount role they are discursively and practically playing on the political scene domestically and worldwide.

2. Integrating Cognitive and Society-based Perspectives: the Interplay of Social Cognition and Understanding of Discourse

Interpersonal interaction within the purview of the socio-cultural context has taken a socio-cognitive direction in the recent decades. In fact, for such experts versed in the multi-disciplinary field of CDA as Langlotz (2015), the cognitive aspect of world representation has been extensively explored in the very field of social cognition. Nonetheless, discursive reception in social situations remained devoid of really notable, strongly evidenced findings for long. Additionally, earlier “cognitivism” in connection with “sense-making” has limited its scope merely upon construing social reality as social “input” (knowledge). As a result, it has had its share of criticism from such scholarly circles, especially discourse analysis (DA), conversation analysis (CA), ethno-methodology, and later CDA. Significantly, language should be viewed as a context-dependent social activity (“social practice”), not a set of knowledge encrypting perceptions. Accordingly, scholars have been of like

minds in assuming that such a perspective would eventually inform the platform of the overall CDA research to follow. I.e., the term discourse stems out to be ubiquitously used this respect denoting the social dimension underlying its functioning with the purpose of generating various meanings across particular instances (“situations”) and “settings” (Bloommaert; Gee as cited in Langlotz, 2015; Fairclough & Wodak as cited in Wodak & Busch, 2004; Benque, as cited in Wodak & Busch, 2004; Lemke as cited in Mazid, 2014). A renewal of interest in this orientation has to be prioritized in dealing with discourse.

From the above-referred to angle, theorists alongside scholars in CDA have delved in elaborating a novel, multi-faceted theoretical model regarding socio-cultural interchange. In this respect, Van Dijk, among many other peer experts in CDA or critical discourse studies (SDS), have engaged in putting in place a framework that exploits the various cognitive processes piloting and ruling discursive production as well as reception (Wodak, 2001). The latter rests principally upon the fast evolving socio-psychological trend in the study of discourse; in other words, the examination of language in the field of social psychology would lever advantageous findings since it is omnipresent in humans’ routine social interchanges throughout the various domains of life (Djamaan trans. 2016; Potter & Wetherel, 1987). This novel approach, would add much more complexity to fundamental terms, notably in linguistics, psychology, sociology, and anthropology among others as all of them converge in one point: discourse in social and cognitive contexts (Brown & Yule as cited in Potter & Wetherel, 1987; Van Dijk, 2014a, 2014b, 2008a, 2012, 1989, 1991; Widdowson, 2004; Wodak & Busch, 2004). From the first glimpse, this new approach tackles how individuals analyze and

make meaning of the messages they encounter daily relying on their mental capacities within their social groups.

3-Critical Discourse Analysis, Cognition, Knowledge, and Society: the Synergy of CDA and Social Cognition

Engaging in the task of performing CDA requires necessarily a consideration of some key concepts in the field as guidelines theoretically alongside empirically. Firstly, the term discourse needs a definition that draws on divergent perceptions and domains. The latter term, according to Mills (2004), has witnessed a series of renewal of conceptions arising from various fields in the recent decades. Nevertheless, the same scholar maintains that embedding discourse in a multidisciplinary container would likely be misleading; in such areas there are several interpretations stemming from the term. Thereby, we would exclusively focus our attention on the definitions that are closely connected to CDA. In this sense, Crystal (as cited in Mills, 2004), considers discourse in comparison with text. For him, the study of discourse (DA) has to deal with the structural composition of speech, while text must concentrate on the same dimension but of written language. Indeed, this conception relevantly evokes Harris's (as cited in Widdowson, 2004) own definition; discourse is a set of a structural equivalences constituting textual sequences. Additionally, each of them shapes the one that follows continually. Remarkably, discourse and text are conflated to mean the same thing—Harris regards them as the linguistic output produced by writers; Stubbs, likewise, assumes that these are linguistic lengths larger than written or spoken clauses (Harris & Stubbs as cited in Widdowson, 2004). On the other side of argument and with the rise of the functional aspect of language, there has emerged the structural formation as well as the

functional force underlying discourse; to say it otherwise, it entails interpersonal interaction—producer/receiver with discourse being the intended social goal and text the external construction (Mills, 2004; Leech and Short as cited in Mills, 2004). Subsequently, Benveniste (as cited in Mills, 2004); Brown and Yule as cited in Mills, 2004, 1983), building on the above distinction, come up with even a more exact elaboration. For these, discourse equals communication. In short, they point to it as a case of language in use (context-based language use). Significantly, more attention has been diverted to the socially interactional aspect underpinning such a form of language (Brown & Yule, 1983). At this level, the unveiling of clues to do with the social context and the way discourse relates to them becomes crucial so as a meaning can be inferred (Cutting, 2008; Widdowson, 2004). All in all, discourse stands for language use in social context.

Secondly, by going over discourse, the notion of interpersonal exchange lends itself automatically to the whole discussion. As starters, successful or, in clear terms, effective interaction entails harmony between both interlocutors (speaker and listener). By implication the terms cognition and society come to play a significant part in the communicative process; in fact, interaction relies, basing on this socio-cognitive frame work, on generic knowledge as an intrinsic feature of social groups or sub-groups, which assumes the form of “*general cultural knowledge*” or “*shared knowledge*” (Cutting, 2008; Van Dijk, 2014a). In the light of this multidisciplinary approach to CDA, scholars alongside theorists from distinct respects—psychology, social sciences, anthropology, ethnography, epistemology among others— suggest how socio-cultural membership supposedly determines the type of generic knowledge (“*socio-cultural*

knowledge”) to be adhered to and discursively disseminated by such perception bearers as “*justified beliefs*” (“*beliefs as full knowledge*”) upholding “*epistemic communities*”. As a result, no subject can carry out effective communication with his/her peers except if he/she manages to access such common knowledge about the way discourse is constructed and received as well (Condor & Antaki, 1997; Van Dijk, 2003; Van Dijk, 2014a; Van Dijk, 2016). Knowledge and discourse, as Van Dijk, (2014a) stresses, overlap so inextricably that they cannot be split from each other, importantly. At this point, there emerges the complex nature of this connection; actually, this empirical enterprise forms the core of the newly elaborated theory of context, whereby Van Dijk delves in cracking into the how underlying such a relationship. In fact, he explains that a large part of such theorizing revolves around knowledge of participants in interaction. This strategy links to the constant adoption to others’ knowledge about the world as a prerequisite for all kinds of daily interchanges since every member of a community is presupposed to have it as part of discourse. Besides, such knowledge takes on an abstract nature in that it is not communicated explicitly as part of context; equally, to make sense of discourses, interlocutors are expected to activate that general knowledge about the world. In effect, the afore-mentioned knowledge is in the form of “mental representations” — what people already have as experiential knowledge of the world. Broadly, such representations encompass subjective perceptions of various happenings that are spawned by their daily experiences. However, these seemingly partial understandings come under the aegis of several schematic structures underpinning divergent social groups’ ways of practicing their discursive events (shared knowledge). Thereby, this gives impetus to individual mental models unfolding within ideological

containers, so here lies the co-constructed context extending to the socio-cultural surrounding. Last but not least the whole matter demands a consideration of cognitive processes in connection with the language system under the realm of socio-cultural institutions (Van Dijk, 2008; 2016, 2014a, 2009; Potter & Edwards, 2003). For instance, we would refer to the issue of refugees' influx in Europe and how it is perceived either by right-or-left wing politicians. All in all, interaction requires its participants to invoke their socio-cultural belongings to operate effectively.

4-Ideology, Power, Politics, Discourse, and Domination

By covering the socio-cognitive account relevant to interpersonal communication, it would be a must-do focusing on ideology, power, politics, discourse, and domination all interrelated. Initially, we have to focus on ideology; as a matter of fact, one of the many definitions of it states that it encapsulates a set of ideas or specific beliefs either symmetrical or asymmetrical with certain classes or groups. Also, ideology has an epistemological underpinning. I.e., it branches to various grasps of the world. Alternatively, ideology is seen as being “action-oriented” because it pertains narrowly to legitimizing the power of dominant entities—elites— in society by keeping intact the existing power relations. This, indeed, consists primarily in “naturalizing” as well as “universalizing” particular beliefs as “self-evident” (Eagleton, 1991; Thomson as cited in Eagleton, 1991; Van Dijk, 2003). As such, since ideology stands for, according to Desttut's own conception (as cited in Van Dijk, 2003), a particular “system of beliefs” of certain gatherings (social, religious, political, etc), its, basing on Van Dijk's (2000, 2003) theoretical orientation, is viewed from a socio-cognitive scope requiring generic endorsement from respective subjects with shared perceptions of the world. At this level, discourse plays the medium of

legitimization and encapsulation and dissemination of ideology. Simultaneously, what shapes discourse is the set of social conventions (shared knowledge) crafted and imposed by powerful social groups via their own ideological standpoints. In other terms, this whole state of affairs represents the unequal relations of power pervading society and forming the status quo under the supervision of social institutions. Originally, as Mayr (2000) remarks, this society-oriented approach to discourse owes much to Foucault's seminal insights into the connection between society and knowledge. First of all, he points out that different "areas of knowledge" are regulated by such social norms. This denotes the close link between knowledge, power, and domination. Afterwards, the latter includes discourse to emphasize the regulatory nature of the just-evoked norms concerning its operations socially. Nevertheless, total obedience to those structures is continually at stake as there is resistance to them through divergent discourses intended to oppose or even subvert them—"social stability and order or challenge and destabilization". In effect, power and domination intersect as well in the process of discursive reproduction of the unfair relations of control in social entities regarding: class, ethnicity, religion, sex, age, race, etc (Fairclough, 1989; Fairclough & Wodak as cited in Wodak & Busch, 2004). Therefore, discourse can have ideological consequences socially speaking. With regard to this point, Habermas (as cited in Abidi trans., 2016) critically sheds light on the delusiveness of ideology in reflecting reality and disseminating it in society by means of discourse. That is, drawing on Eagleton's (1991) term social "mystification" to the advantage of the elites.

5-CDA-based Analysis of the Selected Corpus of the Russian Leadership

Table 1 A Macro Structure CDA Analysis of Russian Prime Minister’s statement on the War in Ukraine 2022

Theme/Topic	“Recently, the military of Russia together with Donetsk and Lugansk forces discovered documents of the Ukrainian general staff indicating clearly that they were preparing a massive attack against Donetsk and Lugansk republics, so the operation which was launched by Russia in fact pre-empted this threat and did not allow them to implement what they wanted to do...”
-------------	--

Table 2 A Micro Structure Analysis of Russia’s Prime Minister Sergey Lavrov’s Statement on the War in Ukraine 2022

Semantics (Super structure)	✓ This stage of analysis starts with introductory part of Mr Lavrov’s statement. The latter reveals the latest discovery made by the combined military efforts of Russia and its allies (Donetsk and Lugansk). Then comes the body, which “uncovers” a Ukrainian-devised plan to attack the two pro-Russian
-----------------------------	---

Semantics (Super structure)	republics. Finally, it concludes with pre-emptive actions to block the Ukrainian military operations. ✓ We, after that, focus on the source where the corpus has been selected: TRT World, A Turkey-funded network. For the quoting technique, it is direct (uttered by the person in question—Mr Lavrov. ✓ For the setting, the statement was in aftermath of the Russian intervention in Ukraine and the ensuing military conflict between the two countries. ✓ To show opposition, antithesis is used. Thus, the speaker refers to “Russia together with Donetsk and Lugansk forces”; then, their common enemy (“the Ukrainian general staff”). Likesise, animosity is encapsulated via the sentence “...they were preparing a
------------------------------------	--

	massive attack against Donetsk and Lugansk republics” and the clearly opposing one “...so the operation which was launched by Russia in fact pre-empted this threat and did not allow them to implement what they wanted to do”. ✓ Concerning rhetorical figures of speech, we remark the use of an adjectival metaphor in support of the theme of attack claimed by the Russian official: “massive attack” to emphasize its seriousness and large scale.
Lexis Lexis	✓ To express Russia’s ideological stances towards “others”—Ukrainian leadership—The Minister of foreign affairs utilized specific words. First, he uses the nationality adjective to point to the identity the “enemy” (Ukrainian). Then, the “general” to specify the

Lexis	occupation as well as rank of the addressed staff. Besides, to give much importance to the claimed attack by the Ukrainian army, he uses the one-word adjective (massive). Ultimately, the adjectival clause "...which was launched by Russia..." modifies the type of operation (retaliatory action). Similarly, the prepositional phrase performs the same function of identification and belonging in "...discovered documents of the Ukrainian general staff...". The aim here is ascribe the planning of attacks to the Ukrainian military. ✓ Equally, such adverbs like clearly function as strong evidence in support of participle form (indicating) and his claims. In the same register, in the sentence "they were preparing a massive attack against Donetsk and Lugansk
---------------------	--

	republics”, the prepositional phrase modifies the verb and gives it much clarity and power. In the end, an infinitive phrase and a dependent clause respectively explain the meaning of the stated verb in “did not allow them to implement what they wanted to do”. Therefore, the anti-Ukrainian discourse and the underlying ideology adopted by the Russian leadership are conveyed through carefully chosen wording to have effective results: mobilizing the public opinion in Russia as well as the world. ✓ Concerning noun and pronoun frequencies, we can see the omnipresence of the nouns (the military of Russia, Donetsk and Lugansk republics, Donetsk and Lugansk forces) in opposition to (the Ukrainian general staff, they, and them).
--	---

Syntax	✓ For this aspect of study, we would first focus on coordinators that can bear in them various functions. We observe the employment of “and” and “so”. The former shows agreement (Russians and their “allies” “Donetsk and Lugansk forces”); i.e. both share the same perception of the political situation (Ukrainian invasion of Donetsk and Luhansk with the majority of originally Russia citizens. The latter, implies the pre-emptive military intervention by the Russian and their “allies” as an imminent measure to stop the Ukrainian “invaders”. Thus, seems to give legitimacy the Russians’ plan of action. ✓ Furthermore, in order to give much impetus to his ideology-laden discourse, Mr Lavrov tends to use the active voice
---------------	--

Syntax	when referring to his government's military actions in Ukraine. Indeed, by placing the Russian and their "allies" forces (Donetsk and Luhansk forces" first in the sentence, he gives them agency; he gives importance to them as doers of action in defense against the "invaders". As once, the Minister does the same with the opposite side as the perpetrators of a probable "invasion" as the "discovered" document reveal. This indicates the Russian government's ideological stance towards its pro-republics and their common enemy. However, there is remarkable shift to the passive form in "...the operation which was launched by Russia..." intended to reduce attention on the Russia by putting it this time last as a passive doer ad placing the object in its initial place.
---------------	--

	Equally, he utilizes nominalization (“operation”) for the same purpose concealing the Russian responsibility momentarily as an “invader”. Hence, generic knowledge about this conflict Russian leadership shares and strives to encode, mediate, and disseminate via discourse has an ideological nature in that it represents Ukrainian government and its army as the source of this war with its “planned attacks” to invade the pro-Russia republics. Also, this discourse acts as plea to any military action the Russians would take—to pre-empt any eventual attacks.
--	---

Table 3 A Macro Structure Analysis of Russian President Vladimir Putin’s Statement Announcing the Invasion of Ukraine, February 24th, 2022

Theme/Topic	“Circumstances require firm and immediate actions from us. Donbas’s People’s republics asked for help
-------------	---

	from Russia. In this regard, according to the article 51 part 7 of the United Nations charter, with consent of the Russian Federation Council and in accordance with the ratified agreement of 22 February of this year of friendship and mutual aid with Donetsk People’s Republic and Luhansk People’s Republic, I decided to conduct a special military operation. Its goal is the protection of people who, during eight years, suffer from abuse and genocide from the Kyiv regime. We urge you to lay down arms immediately and go home. I will explain: all servicemen of the Ukrainian army, who comply with this requirement, can freely leave the area of military actions and return to their families. Whoever would try to stop us and further create threats to our country, to our people should know that Russia’s response would be immediate and lead you to such consequences that you have never faced in your history. We are ready for any outcome. I am
--	---

	confident that loyal soldiers and officers of Russia’s Armed Forces fulfill their duty professionally and courageously”.
--	--

Table 4 A Micro Structure CDA Analysis of Russian President Vladimir Putin’s Statement on the War in Ukraine War February 24th ,2022

Semantics (Super structure)	✓ President Putin introduces his speech with Russia’s solemn and firm intention to come in support of its “allies”, “Donetsk People’s Republic and Luhansk People’s Republic”. This has been undertaken in accordance with the UN’s charter “51 part 7” and upon consent with Federation Council of Russia as well as the mutual aid agreement of February 22nd. He refers to as “a “special military operation”. ✓ In the body of his speech, the President explains the major goals of the above operation which revolve essentially
------------------------------------	---

Semantics (Super structure)	around protecting “Russian people” in both republics from the so-called oppression of the “Kyiv Regime”. At the same time, President Putin firmly and threateningly urges Ukrainian military to lay down arms and clear the military area and promises that they can get free home and be spared any harm. ✓ To conclude, he encapsulates his confidence in Russian military men in the professional and brave fulfillment of their duties. ✓ As for the sources of the corpus, it is Associated Press, February 24th, 2022. It is a direct source. ✓ Concerning the rhetorical figures of speech employed to add more support to the overall theme (Russia military action in Ukraine, we have on in the
------------------------------------	---

Semantics (Super structure)	form of verb/noun (metaphor) in “Circumstances require firm and immediate actions from us”. It is as if the existing context is a group of humans in a desperate situation asking for help (from the Russian government). And other feature this technique is parallelism in emphasizing agreement. Actually, this is encapsulated in “... of friendship and mutual aid with Donetsk People’s Republic and Luhansk People’s Republic...”. Here, Russia and its two allies are on the same wavelength. On the contrary, antithesis, which expresses disagreement and animosity, appears throughout the speech. Hence, in the passage, “...all servicemen of the Ukrainian army, who comply with this requirement, can freely leave the area of military actions and return to their families.
------------------------------------	---

Whoever would try to stop us and further create threats to our country, to our people should know that Russia's response would be immediate and lead you to such consequences that you have never faced in your history", the Russian leader, uses both peace and threat of retaliation in case such men try to block Russia in his offer for the Ukrainian servicemen. This discourse carries in it opposition. For the same purpose, nouns, pronouns, and phrases are also deployed: "we" vs. "you" (addressing Ukrainian military, "Kyiv regime" vs. "Russian Federation Council", "loyal soldiers and officers of Russia's Armed Forces" vs. "all servicemen of the Ukrainian army".

280

Lexis	the Ukrainian army, who comply with this requirement, can freely leave the area of military actions...”. ✓ Adverbs, equally, are used to express variant meanings by adding certain characteristics to verbs. E.g., we can refer to, “...can freely leave...” to suggest manner of treating those who would quiz the Ukrainian forces by the Russian military. The same is expressed through, “...officers of Russia’s Armed Forces fulfill their duty professionally and courageously”. In, “...suffer from abuse and genocide from the Kyiv regime”, the prepositional phrase adds to the verb showing Putin’s attitude towards Kyiv (the “source of harm” to Russian people in Donbas). ✓ Model verbs have their functional effects, too. In fact,
---------------------	--

	in the passage, “Whoever would try to stop us and further create threats to our country, to our people should know that Russia’s response would be immediate and lead you to such consequences...”, he employs the subjunctive form (“would try”) to suggest that if Kyiv perpetrated any anti-Russian actions, Moscow would retaliate instantly and toughly. This threat, according to Putin, is to be taken as something peremptory (to be obeyed) with the use of (“should”). To suggest determination, Putin uses the form, “I will explain...”; to make it clear he is very serious and solemn about his decision (to launch a special military operation in Ukraine). ✓ To focus on certain, major themes key nouns are frequently repeated. For
--	--

	instance, “Russia” is repeated to signal its central position in defense against the “aggressors”. Also, in support of it, such nouns as “Russian Federation Council” “soldiers”, “officers”, and “Armed Forces”. On the opposite side, we have “Kyiv regime”, “servicemen of the Ukrainian army” to express animosity between the two. ✓ The similar use of pronouns is suggestive of the theme of animosity: “us”, “our” “we”, “I” vs. “their”, “you”, “your”.
Syntax	✓ For the syntactic construction, we stress such forms as subordination whereby ideological stances are encapsulated towards topics and others. Thus, in, “Whoever would try to stop us and further create threats to our country, to our people should know that Russia’s response would be

Syntax

immediate and lead you to such consequences that you have never faced in your history”, he implies the punishment awaiting those who would represent a potential menace to Russia and its people. Modality is, also, called for to signal obligation (command) in, “...should know that...” to remind the Ukrainian military of their “fatal fate” if they disregard his threat.

- ✓ Most of the forms in Putin’s speech are in the active form. Actually, Putin, as the Russian leader, emphatically says, “...I decided to conduct a special military operation” stressing his active role as doer (agent) in the course of events. The same is applicable in, “We urge you to lay down arms immediately...” and “I will explain...”. On the other hand

	to make the Ukrainians feel liable for any eventuality, he states, “...you have never faced in your history” accentuating “you” as active agents implying the seriousness of Russian response that would outstand any other “torments” they had endured before. This also, encapsulates perceptions of the world from given ideological angles—Russia is still a super power and has the moral and legal right to defend its citizens and territories. ✓ Cohesion is ensured through the use of particular cohesive devices to show a variety of functions. By way of illustration, we would mention, “and” in “We urge you to lay down arms immediately and go home...” and, “can freely leave the area of military actions and return to their families”. Here, there is consistency in Putin’s
--	---

	speech, which is a sign of agreement between him and his staff (officials and officers). To further make his statement clear, he paraphrases after saying, “I will explain: all servicemen of the Ukrainian army...”; the reinforces his assertion regarding the decision taken by him and the ideological standpoint underpinning it.
--	--

6-Discussion of the Findings

Upon going over the respective speeches of Mr. Lavrov and President Putin, we have arrived at findings that reveal the following points:

- Firstly, it is evident that the commonly held knowledge in Russia about the Ukrainian issue and subsequent military intervention strongly contributes to the fabrication of Russia’s official, political discourse,
- Secondly, this shared knowledge is upheld by dominant perceptions and conceptions of the world,

- Thirdly, such discourse, in turn, serves to legitimize and enforce the existing socio-cultural and political institutions already in place (status quo),
- Fourthly, the same discourse acts a means (tool) whereby generic knowledge is mediated and disseminated on a larger scale (nationally and internationally),
- Fifthly, such basic notions as discourse, power, domination, social cognition, ideology, and politics irreversibly interrelate in the course of interpersonal interactions as well as representations of the self (Russia) and others (the “Ukrainian regime”).

7-Conclusion

To conclude, we have undertaken the task of applying the CDA as a multi-disciplinary approach in the analyses of the speeches of the two prominent figures of the Russian leadership—President Putin alongside Mr. Lavrov, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. For the data gathering, we have relied thoroughly on corpora as tool commonly utilized in the fields of CDA and even sociolinguistics. Besides, we have based our sampling upon quota sampling as it takes into consideration specifically shared socio-cultural and political aspects of the discourse producers (sources) in their classification as members of certain socio-cultural and political entities (groups); hence, our analytical endeavour is purely qualitative in nature. Ultimately, the findings arrived at show that discourse workings are at their heights under the aegis of the set of the established socio-cultural institutions governing Russia’s social fabric. Actually, these encompass a range of generally adhered to

understandings of how the world works across all spheres of life, including geo-politics and its far-reaching radius. Thereby, discursive occurrences both at the micro and macro levels; representations of one's group and others' altogether entail the exercise of power—relations of power within society—as well to determine the ongoing status quo. The above officially institutionalized social order rests on ideology in its broad sense.

Bibliography List:

- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from <https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/960103/c95bc2>
- Condor, S. and Antaki, C. (1997). Social cognition and discourse. In T. A. Van Dijk (Eds.). *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction volume 1* (PP.320-347) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from <https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Discourse+studies%3A+a+multidisciplinary+introduction+volume+1+Van+Dijk>
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: a resource book for students* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from <https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Pragmatics+and+discourse%3A+a+resource+book+for+students+>
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: an introduction* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from <https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/851401/17cad6>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from <https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/905882/0a183c>
- Mayr, A. (2000). *Language as means of social control and resistance: discourse analysis in prison setting* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://theses.gla.ac.uk>
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from <https://booksc.org>
- Potter, J. and Edwards, D. (2003). Sociolinguistics, Cognitivism, and Discursive Psychology. *International Joul of English Studies*, 3 (1), 93-109. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307647001_SOCIOLINGUISTICS_COGNITIVISM_AND_DISCURSIVE_PSYCHOLOGYL/fulltext/57ce991f08ae582e06934237/SOCIOLINGUISTICS-COGNITIVISM-AND-DISCURSIVE-PSYCHOLOGYL.pdf
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: SAGE publications Ltd

- Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Ideology and discourse: a multidisciplinary introduction. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). [Dominik Lukes]. (May27th, 2014). Discourse, communication, and knowledge [video file].
<https://youtube.com/watch?v=303vOQ3EhN8&feature=share>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse: how social contexts influence text and talk* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from <https://booksc.org>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and knowledge: a sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, D. Schiffrin (Eds.) *The handbook of discourse analysis* (PP. 466-485) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from
<https://www.bookzz.ren/s/The%20handbook%20of%20discourse%20analysis%20>
- Widdowson, H., G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from <https://booksc.org>
- Wodak, R. and Busch, B. (2004). Approaches to media texts. Advance online publication.
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292805354_Approaches_to_media_texts#:~:text=According%20to%20Wodak%20and%20Busch,localization%22%20of%20meaning%20\(p](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292805354_Approaches_to_media_texts#:~:text=According%20to%20Wodak%20and%20Busch,localization%22%20of%20meaning%20(p)
- عبيدي, م. (2016). التحليل النقدي للخطاب: نماذج من الخطاب الاعلامي. عمان دار كنوز المعرفة للنشر والتوزيع